

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. | | |
|--|-----------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|--|--|
| 09/990,049 | 11/21/2001 | William Ford | 450117-03449 | 1484 | | |
| 20999 | 7590 01/26/2005 | | EXAM | EXAMINER | | |
| FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG 745 FIFTH AVENUE- 10TH FL. | | | NAFF, DAVID M | | | |
| NEW YORK, | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER | | |
| • | | | 1651 | | | |

DATE MAILED: 01/26/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | |
|---|---|---|--------|--|--|--|
| Advisory Action | 09/990,049 | FORD ET AL. | | | | |
| Advisory Addon | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | |
| | David M. Naff | 1651 | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appe | The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address | | | | | |
| THE REPLY FILED 10 January 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. | | | | | | |
| PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)] | | | | | | |
| a) The period for reply expires 4 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | | | | | | |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. | | | | | | |
| 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because: | | | | | | |
| (a) ⊠ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); | | | | | | |
| (b) ⊠ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below); | | | | | | |
| (c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or | | | | | | |
| (d) they present additional claims without cancel | ing a corresponding number of f | inally rejected claim | s. | | | |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | | | | | | |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | | | | |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s). | | | | | | |
| 5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . | | | | | | |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection. | | | | | | |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we | | | and an | | | |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) allowed: None. | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) objected to: | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) rejected: <u>25-47</u> . | | | | | | |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | | | | | |
| 8. The drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner. | | | | | | |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s) | | | | | | |
| 10. Other: | | | | | | |
| TO Outer | | David M. Naff Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1651 | . Hof- | | | |

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The amendment to dependent claim 26 raises new issues for consideration and the issue of new matter. Claim 25 does not recite "metal nanoparticle nucleic acid component" as now recited in claim 26, and it is uncertain as to where in claim 25 a component is reacted as in dependent claim 26. Claim 25 requires reacting only in lines 4 and 7, and reacting does not require a metal nanoparticle nucleic acid component to be reacted. In regard to new matter, it is not readily apparent where the specification discloses a component reacted as required by dependent claim 26 in a process as required by claim 25.

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: of reasons set forth in the previous office action of 9/8/04. Additionally, in reponse to the argument that the claims require removing non-conjugated complexes and/or by-products, this removing is required only if the non-conjugates complexes and/or by-products are formed. If non-conjugated complexes and/or by-products are not formed in the process of Pompe et al and in the claimed process of copending application 10/210,812, removal is not required as in the claimed process. Pompe et al and the claims of 10/210,812 do not require non-conjugated complexes and/or by-products to be formed.